

### **REMARKS**

Claims 30-41 are pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 30-32. Support for the claim amendments can be found in Applicant's disclosure as published in United States Patent Publication Number 2005/0071813, specifically at paragraphs [0029] – [0035]. Reconsideration of the pending claims is requested.

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Office Action objected to claims 31 and 32 as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 31 and 32 to clarify the manner in which they limit the scope of claim 30. Claim 31 recites forming the annotated object containment hierarchy as a single hierarchy; while claim 32 recites forming the annotated object containment hierarchy as a series of related hierarchies. Support for the claim amendments can be found at paragraph [0044] of Applicant's disclosure.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112**

The Office Action rejected claims 30-41 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 30 has been amended to delete the reference to node destruction.

Claim 30 has been further amended to recite "relationships between the nodes."

The Office Action rejected claims 30-41 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements.

Applicant has substantially amended independent claim 31 to better clarify the elements of the invention.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103**

The Office Action rejected claims 30-37, and 40-41 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Dori (USPTN 7,099,809).

The Office Action submits that AAPA teaches the temporal flow annotations in combination with the object containment information as recited in claim 30. In support, the Office Action on page 4 submits a phrase from Applicant's specification as proof. The Office Action states that AAPA discloses "... well known ways to present either temporal flow or containment information ...". Applicant submits that the entire sentence in which that phrase is found (paragraph [0028]) is: "Current techniques, like those of FIGS. 3A and 3B, have well-known ways to present **either** temporal flow or containment information in isolation, **but fail to unify these types of information in presenting the information to the user.**" [emphasis added] It is clear from this sentence and the entirety of the disclosure that AAPA does not provide for a method to unite the object containment and temporal flow information in such a manner as to present meaningful information to a user.

The Office Action further asserts that Dori discloses combining "the object containment hierarchy with the temporal flow hierarchy to form an annotated object containment hierarchy." Dori's modeling method "generates a textual description of the diagrammed model." Dori, Col. 1, lines 43-45 and Figs. 1-10. In contrast to the claimed subject matter, Dori receives as input a graphical model. Based on this input, Dori describes the model using text. "The method may include translating a label of a graphic element from a first natural language to a second natural

language.” Dori, Col. 1, line 66 – Col. 2, line 1. Dori also teaches the reverse, where a textual description of a model is the input and the method generates “a model diagram composed of different graphic elements.” Col. 2, lines 10-11.

A significant difference between Dori and the instant application is that Dori uses modeling to describe what is being shown; whereas the current invention uses annotations to describe what is *not* shown. Claim 30 has been amended to clarify this difference. Claim 30 now recites: “generating a temporal flow hierarchy, wherein the temporal flow hierarchy comprises control flow and node creation information, linking events contributing to a state of the program during the node transition and describing said events; wherein at least some of the events are not referenced in the object containment hierarchy.”

The Office Action rejected claim 38 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dori and further in view of Hunsinger et al. (USPGN 20020165997).

Claim 38 is not unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dori and further in view of Hunsinger because, as stated earlier, AAPA does not teach the combination of the temporal flow hierarchy with the object containment hierarchy. Further, Dori and Hunsinger likewise do not teach or suggest this key element of claim 30 from which claim 38 derives.

The Office Action rejected claim 39 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dori and further in view of Ohta et al. (USPGN 20030120640).

Claim 39 is not unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dori and further in view of Ohta for the reasons as described with respect to claim 38.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Buchenhorner/

Michael J. Buchenhorner  
Reg. No. 33,162

E-Filed on Date: October 8, 2008

Michael Buchenhorner, P.A.  
8540 S.W. 83 Street  
Miami, Florida 33143  
(305) 273-8007 (voice)  
(305) 595-9579 (fax)